IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE
ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE NOOTY RAMAMOHANA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO :27616 of 1998

-

-

-

Dated: 23rd August 2007.

-

Between:

Smt. A.Bhagyam, W/o late Sri A.Prabhakar, aged 31 years, Occ: Attender, resident of 1-8-3/22/2, beside Narayanaguda Bridge, Chikkadapalli, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

Potti Sriramulu Telugu University, Nampally, Hyderabad represented by its Registrar and another.

.....RESPONDENTS

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NOOTY RAMAMOHANA RAO

W.P.NO.27616 OF 1998

ORAL ORDER:

This writ petition has been instituted seeking a declaration that the action of the respondents in not regularizing the services of the petitioner as an Attender, as arbitrary act on their part.

The writ petitioner asserts that upon the death of her husband, she came to be appointed as an Attender in the 2nd respondent-University on 16-08-1993 and ever since she has been regularly working, but, unfortunately, her services have not been regularized so far.

Heard Sri Nandigam Krishna Rao for the writ petitioner and the learned Standing Counsel for the 1st respondent-University Ms. Bh.Bharati Devi.

It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that since services of an Attender being essentially needed on the ministerial establishment of the University, the writ petitioner is continued in service, but however, only on the plea that the State Government has not yet accorded the necessary approval, her services have not been regularized.

The learned Standing Counsel for the

1st respondent-University had also pointed out that various measures and steps are taken to secure regularization of the services of the employees working on daily-wage basis, consolidated basis and casual basis in the University and who are continuing in service for a very long time and that at various stages the matter is examined. The learned Standing Counsel would also point out that the A.P. State Council for Higher Education had also initiated steps for securing the regularization of the services of various varieties and categories of employees working in the

1st respondent-University. The learned Standing Counsel, in fact, has placed a communication addressed by the University on 25th June 2005 to the Secretary to the A.P. State Council for Higher Education in that regard. The University has proposed to regularize the services of several employees like the petitioner herein upon careful assessment of the manpower requirement. The 1st respondent-University had also clearly indicated its preparedness to bear the additional expenditure, which will be visiting it upon regularization of the services of the temporary employees, daily-wage employees, casual employees, etc., from out of the

income generated by it, in particular, from the Distance Education Programmes run by it. It is, therefore, clear that the

1st respondent-University, which is not only growing in strength, has also picked up the necessary financial capabilities to meet the additional expenditure likely to arise from out of the regularization of the services of the employees, who have been working with it for a very long time, such as, ten years or above period. It is only, therefore, appropriate that the State Government, whose approval has been solicited by the 1st respondent-University in this regard, shall examine the entire issue in quick time and communicate its decision to the 1st respondent-University.

I, therefore, direct the 2nd respondent-State Government to carefully consider the proposals submitted by the 1st respondent-University for securing regularization of the services of the temporary employees, daily-wage employees, casual employees engaged by it, for long periods, such as, ten years and above and communicate its informed decision to the

1st respondent-University within a maximum of period of four months from now. The decision of the

2nd respondent be communicated latest by 31st December 2007 based upon which the 1st respondent-University is directed to consider and regularize the services of the writ petitioner and also other similarly placed employees.

With these, the writ petition stands disposed of, but however, without costs.

Nooty Ramamohana Rao, J

mrk
23rd August 2007.